

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 807

SP 030 130

AUTHOR Etheridge, Carol P.; And Others
TITLE The Effects of Type of Teacher Preparation Program on Internships in Secondary Schools.
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., TN. Center of Excellence in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (New Orleans, LA, February 17-20, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Mentors; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Alternative Teacher Certification; Extended Degree Programs

ABSTRACT

Replacing student teaching with internships and replacing clinical supervision with mentoring have been suggested as needed reforms in teacher preparation. Memphis State University (Tennessee) has initiated three different secondary teacher preparation programs: (1) a baccalaureate program with a full day and 10- to 12-week internship; (2) a 15 month, master's degree program with a three phase, 9-month internship and extensive mentoring; and (3) a post-baccalaureate, 12-month, alternative teacher certification program with a 9-month internship and extensive mentoring. This study documented student involvement in teaching activities during each model's field experiences, and investigated student views of internship and school-related components. An overview is presented of the major components of each program. The subjects of the study were 97 interns or student teachers completing one of the three programs. Differences in internship activities and differences in perceptions subjects held toward their experiences, mentor support, and school related factors are discussed. Findings indicate that, while no one program was superior to the others, similar and different outcomes resulted. Data from the study are displayed in 11 tables and 22 references are included. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED293807

The Effects of Type of Teacher Preparation Program
on Internships in Secondary Schools

Carol P. Etheridge
E. Dean Butler
George W. Etheridge
Terry James

Center of Excellence in Teacher Education
Memphis State University
Barbara Burch, Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. P. Etheridge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting
of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
New Orleans, LA
February, 1988

SP 030130

THE EFFECTS OF TYPE OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM ON INTERNSHIPS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The need for teacher preparation students to practice and demonstrate mastery of teaching skills in a "real life classroom" is one of teacher education's universal axioms, thus, culminating field experiences exist in every program. Teacher preparation programs differ in length, supervision, evaluation, and placement in the program of the field experiences, and not surprisingly, the name of the field experience (i.e. student teaching; practice teaching; internship).

Recent literature (The Holmes Group, 1986; Carnegie Forum on Education and Economy 1986; the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1986; AFT Task Force, 1986) has suggested that traditional student teaching experiences are inadequate for providing transition from college into the first year of teaching. Replacing student teaching with internships and replacing clinical supervision with mentoring have been suggested as needed reforms in teacher preparation. The assumption is that extending the period of time in which students can engage in teaching roles and providing more continuous and nurturing support will improve the quality of the field experiences and enhance the professional development of entry-year teachers.

Bolam (1987) and McDonald (1982) have noted that current research evidence provides little direction for those who plan such experiences in teacher preparation curricula. Further,

research on whether longer culminating field experiences are better is inconclusive (Hersch, Hull and Leighton, 1982).

As an early leader in teacher education reform, Memphis State University initiated two graduate level secondary teacher preparation programs in the 1985-86 school year and removed the baccalaureate program from the catalog. Undergraduates enrolled at that time were permitted to complete their degree plans.

Both graduate programs are designed to prepare secondary teachers and utilize internship experiences and mentor support. Thus three different secondary teacher preparation programs exist: (1) baccalaureate program with a full day, ten to twelve week internship, e.g., student teaching model; (2) a fifteen month, master's degree program with a three phase, nine month internship and extensive mentoring, e.g., phased internship model; and (3) a post-baccalaureate, twelve month, alternative teacher certification program with a nine month, teacher-of-record internship and extensive mentoring, e.g., immersion internship model. Data presented in this paper were obtained from students completing the three programs during the 1986-87 school year.

The study documented student involvement in teaching activities during each model's field experiences and investigated student views of internship and school components. The central question guiding the investigation was: Does the type of teacher preparation program effect students' views of their internship/student teaching and school-related components?

Overview of Three Teacher Preparation Programs

All three of Memphis State's initial secondary teacher certification programs emphasize occupational socialization as a process by which the neophyte learns the culture, norms, and role behavior of the group he or she seeks to be accepted by and to join (Haberman, 1983, pp. 10-11). They are theoretically grounded on Becker's (1964) approach to facilitating change in adults by placing them in the workplace where teaching occurs so they can take on the characteristics required by situations in which they participate. Such experientially-grounded teacher preparation programs, especially the two fifth-year programs, attend to the powerful effect of the context in which the beginning teacher works (Waller, 1932). Waller characterized the beginner as "ready to be formed by teaching" (p. 380).

The baccalaureate program requires the completion of a series of coursework and coordinated field experiences prior to the 10-12 week student teaching experience during the senior year. It emphasizes experiential learning in field settings with field/lab requirements in most professional core and specialized courses. Coursework incorporates education-related principles grounded in the social and behavioral sciences.

Interns in the fifth-year programs are atypical teacher preparation students because they hold baccalaureate degrees when entering the programs. They also differ somewhat from traditional definitions of beginning teachers (Bolam, 1987) because they have not completed all preservice requirements nor student teaching when they assume teaching roles in the

internship. They do, however, possess provisional certificates, have responsibilities typically associated with experienced teachers and are in their beginning teaching year on the Tennessee Career Ladder. As induction schemes, the internships are consistent with one of three types identified by McDonald (1982), i.e., fifth year internships specifically tailored to induct liberal arts graduates into the profession. They also satisfy McDonald's requirements for this type of internship by engaging in half-time teaching with full responsibilities for no less than 5 or 6 months.

The two fifth-year programs reflect various features suggested by advocates of reform in teacher education including expansion of the role of higher education in the initial year of teaching to provide entry-year assistance which helps identify, explicate, and resolve problems and issues of novice teachers. (Howey and Zimpher, 1987). Additional program features encourage more analytical-reflective and inquiry-oriented approaches to teaching and learning (Griffin, 1985) whereby opportunities are provided to "reflect on practice" (Yinger, 1987) and recognize and value the workplace as "the setting for adaptation and inquiry during the first year of teaching" (Feiman-Nemser, 1983).

Since the fifth-year programs were designed to attract high-ability persons, including those who have had careers in other fields, unique programmatic features were intentionally planned to modify the types of experiences normally associated with entry-year teachers. The following features summarize some of those:

- a. emphasis on explicit and analytical learning and assessment of teaching behavior and not permitting, if possible, as Lortie (1975) claimed was typically the case, for learning to be imitative and intuitive.
- b. encouraging collegial interactions among novices and experienced professionals that foster discourse about the challenges, opportunities, and problems of teaching which negate the typical patterns of novice's seeking advice or assistance only when they experience difficulties (Little, 1982).
- c. altering the traditional roles of beginning teachers as "working largely alone" (Lortie, 1966) which prohibits one from making working knowledge explicit and "keeping one's victories private" (p. 59).
- d. providing for diverse planned and systematic school-based activities such as opportunities to observe various approaches to instruction and participation in the total life of the school (Bolam, 1987).
- e. induction jointly planned by college and LEA personnel and securing the support of school principals and district administrators (Bolam, 1987).
- f. provisions for systematic and extended assistance for at least one school year by persons called mentors who are assigned that responsibility.

While these programs have the commonalities cited above, the unique characteristics of the culminating field experiences must also be understood and so are summarized below.

Student Teaching

Student teaching is a culminating experience for students completing baccalaureate programs in secondary education. Students are assigned to and housed with cooperating classroom teachers who serve as a models, guides, and evaluators. Each placement begins with observations of the cooperating classroom teacher. Gradually, the student teachers assume all teaching responsibilities including responsibility for designing and implementing instruction. Supervisors from the university also

observe the students, provide corrective feedback, and conduct evaluations. In this paper, students completing the student teaching experience are referred to as 4-year subjects.

Phased Internship

An extended phased internship is the focal experience for students completing the 15 month Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree. The interns are placed in public school classrooms where they are housed with and directed by classroom teachers called mentors. These mentors have released time from teaching so they can observe, advise, support and evaluate the interns. Pedagogical mentors (education professors) from the university also observe, advise, support and evaluate the interns. Throughout the internship the pedagogical mentors meet weekly with small groups or with individual interns for debriefing, sharing, and problem solving.

Internship phases consist of three experiences in at least three different junior or senior high schools. The first phase begins in September and consists of two three-week, half-day placements in two different school systems and in junior and senior high school levels. These placements provide opportunity for interns to observe and assist classroom teachers in various teaching responsibilities. During the second phase -- a seven-week, half-day placement -- interns are placed in a third school setting where they gradually assume complete responsibility for teaching three classes. Concurrent with these two internship phases the interns attend university classes and plan their theses.

The third phase is a semester-long, all day placement. Interns begin and end this phase congruent with the school system's second semester. Typically this placement is a continuation of the second phase, i.e. in the same school and with the same mentor. The interns assume complete teaching responsibilities for two classes, assist the mentor with two classes, and have two periods for planning. They are expected to participate in all activities associated with teaching and collect data for the thesis. During this third phase interns participate in the local education agency's (LEA) teacher evaluation program. If successful, the state's probationary teaching year requirement is satisfied and interns enter their first full-time teaching positions as second year teachers.

Subjects participating in this phased experience are referred to here as Internship 1 subjects.

Immersion Internship

This internship is the focal experience for students completing a 12 month graduate level certification program. Interns serve as regular teachers with a reduced teaching load of 3 classes and are expected to assume other teacher responsibilities such as homeroom and extracurricular activities, faculty meetings and inservice obligations, and observation of other teachers. The immersion internships are congruent with the calendar of the school system where interns are placed. Concurrent with the internship, interns attend campus-based courses and attend weekly seminars designed as debriefing,

sharing, and problem solving sessions. These university obligations bring the interns to campus one night each week.

Classroom teachers are assigned to the interns as mentors but the interns are housed in their own classrooms, separate from their mentors. The classroom mentors are expected to observe, advise and support the interns, but do not formally evaluate them. University education and arts and science faculty are assigned to provide additional mentoring support. Education mentors observe, advise and evaluate the interns and the arts and sciences mentors assist with content related activities.

These interns participate in the LEA's teacher evaluation program; if successful, they satisfy the state's required probationary teaching year and enter their first full-time teaching positions as second-year teachers. Students participating in this total immersion internship are referred to as Internship 2 subjects in this paper.

Methodology

Data were collected through ethnographic interviews and observations during the 1986-87 academic and internship experiences and at the end of the 1986-87 culminating field experiences using the Teacher Induction Inventory (TII). The coupling of these qualitative and quantitative research methods allowed researchers to identify contextual factors that may have influenced differences existing within and between programs. A full-time ethnographer attended the interns' university classes and meetings, observed in classes taught by the interns, and interviewed interns, faculty, program directors, and mentors

throughout program implementation. This researcher immersion in the day-to-day activities provided an holistic and more complete understanding and documentation of program processes and subject perspectives than are provided by other research methods.

Ethnographic observation and interview data were recorded as field notes immediately or within 24 hours of collection. Data were indexed and content analyzed for emergent patterns using post hoc analysis and the circular analysis described by Hutchinson (1986) where the researcher "simultaneously collects, codes, and analyzes data from the first day in the field" (p. 57).

The TII solicits students' ratings of their involvement in various teaching activities that could occur during the student teaching and internship experiences and their perceptions of mentoring support and school factors. Data reported here were obtained through seven of the scales comprising the inventory. One is a six point Likert type scale on which interns rate levels of involvement in 28 teaching activities. The others are semantic differential scales measuring attitudes toward the internships, mentor support, and school related features.

Group mean ratings of the internship activities were analyzed using a oneway analysis of variance followed by a Scheffe post-hoc procedure to determine if statistically significant differences existed among the paired means. Group means for the items and total semantic differential scales were analyzed using oneway analyses of variance with the Scheffe post-hoc procedure used when appropriate.

Subjects

Subjects were 97 interns or student teachers completing one of three secondary level teacher preparation programs at Memphis State University in 1986-87: 50 student teachers (4-year subjects), 30 phased interns (Internship 1 subjects), and 17 immersion interns (Internship 2 subjects).

The 4-year subjects ranged in age from 21 to 48 with a median age of 25. Phased internship subjects ranged in age from 22 to 56 with a median age of 38.5. Immersion internship subjects ranged in age from 24 to 50 with a median age of 32 (Table 1).

Both sexes were adequately represented within the groups -- 18 males and 32 females in the 4-year group; 11 males and 19 females in the Internship 1 group; 8 males and 9 females in the Internship 2 group (Table 1).

Most major academic content areas were represented in each subject group including social science, science, math, English, art, and foreign language (Table 2).

Subjects from all groups represented placements in junior and senior high schools except one student in Internship 1 who was placed in an elementary school (Table 3).

Findings

Involvement in Teaching Activities

As shown in Table 4, teaching activities assessed by the TII are grouped into four categories: instructional implementation (teacher-student interactions designed to promote student learning); instructional recordkeeping (documenting or keeping

track of information related to grades, attendance, conduct, etc.); non-instructional activities (observing, conferencing, or meeting with school-related people but not students); and instructional preparation activities (preparing instruction related plans, materials, and activities to be used in instructional implementation).

Instructional implementation activities. No significant differences among the groups were found for involvement in instructional implementation activities. Monitoring and assisting students and providing large group instruction showed the highest reported levels of involvement for all three groups. Tutoring individual students and directing laboratory activities were reported to have the lowest level of involvement by all three groups. This data reflect the typical mode of teaching at the secondary level and thus are expected findings.

Instructional recordkeeping activities. No significant differences among the groups were found regarding instructional recordkeeping (Table 4). All groups reported similar levels of involvement in these activities. Each group reported less involvement in homeroom responsibilities than for the other recordkeeping activities.

Non-instructional activities. Significant differences existed among groups on six non-instructional activities (Table 4). Observing classroom instruction and observing non-instructional activities showed significantly ($p < .01$) more participation by 4-Year and Internship 1 subjects.

The Internship 1 and 4-year subjects had experiences in more than one school with more than one classroom teacher-mentor. In addition, they taught in the same classrooms with their mentors or cooperating teachers. This diverse experience and proximity to support persons provided greater opportunity for observation than were available for Internship 2 subjects who taught in classrooms separate from their mentors and who experienced one school placement.

Ethnographic interview data indicate that Internship 1 subjects felt comfortable asking their mentors to arrange observations in other teacher's classrooms while Internship 2 subjects were sometimes reticent to "impose" on their mentoring teachers. Thus, Internship 2 subjects were less likely to observe their mentors or request observations of other teachers in the school.

Attendance at faculty meetings, participation in parent conferences and participation in school and department meetings showed significantly greater ($p < .01$) involvement by Internship 2 subjects. These findings may reflect differences in program designs. Internship 2 subjects were employees of the school systems. They were viewed by themselves and by teachers, administrators, parents and students as regular teachers. Thus, these interns reported feeling compelled to participate in all such teacher activities.

Internship 1 subjects were teachers-of-record and viewed themselves as "real" teachers only during the third internship phase. Like Internship 2 subjects, they were expected by program planners to engage in these activities just as any teacher would.

However, many interns, during the third phase, reported wanting to be seen as "real" teachers but their teacher-mentors continued to view them as student teachers. In other cases, interns reported wanting to be viewed as student teachers. These individuals did not feel compelled to routinely attend school meetings or hold parent conferences. In both situations, interns reported a tendency to leave parent conferencing as their mentor's responsibility.

The 4-Year subjects were expected to have involvement in these activities though at a reduced level. Their reports of lower participation reflects the constricted nature of student teaching. In addition, they remained primarily in student roles; like Internship 1 subjects, they were not compelled to attend school meetings unless invited. Conversations with school personnel and interns suggest a pervasive view that requiring student teachers to attend all meetings was considered a waste of time though attending some meetings was thought to be valuable.

Finally, for the category talking with other teachers, all subjects indicated a relatively high level of engaging in this activity. However, Internship 1 subjects showed significantly lower ($p < .01$) levels of participation than either Internship 2 or 4-Year subjects. Programmatic factors may account for the difference. Internship 2 subjects did not have the constant and close contact with a mentoring teacher that Internship 1 and 4 year subjects experienced. For their survival, some Internship 2 subjects reported feeling compelled to access other teachers for assistance when the mentoring teacher was not available or close at hand. In addition, as

implemented, Internship 2 forced interns to be initiators. Though university mentors were available and assisted Internship 2 interns when requested, they usually did not maintain extensive contact or initiate contact except for evaluation purposes. Internship 1 subjects, however, had been paired with at least three different classroom teachers over the course of their internship phases, met weekly in small seminar groups with a pedagogical mentor, and met weekly in one large seminar group. Because of this planned access to other information sources and support, some Internship 1 subjects reported not needing the assistance of other teachers in the school. Further, Internship 1 subjects were engaged in data collection and library research for their thesis requirement. They reported not having time to "waste" talking with other teachers unless absolutely necessary, thus, they did not spend much time in the lounge where they could visit. One individual reported spending her "free time" in the library storage room because she could work there without being disturbed.

Instructional Preparation Activities. No significant differences were found to exist among the three groups for levels of involvement in instructional preparation activities (Table 4). All three groups reported high levels of participation in preparing instructional materials, designing daily lesson plans, designing tests and evaluations, and developing instructional units.

Ratings of Internship and School Components

The Internship

Ethnographic interviews revealed that most subjects viewed student teaching or the internship as the most valuable component of their teacher preparation. As total scale means in Table 5 indicate, however, Internship 1 and 4-Year subjects were found to have significantly ($p < .05$) more positive attitudes toward the internship and student teaching than did the Internship 2 subjects. Closer examination of the individual adjective pairs reveals that this difference is partly explained by the Internship 2 subjects rating their experiences as more tense.

Ethnographic data revealed that some Internship 2 subjects found the internship to be stressful. Younger and less experienced subjects (under age 30) were more likely to feel lost in the internship and reported having problems with classroom management, selecting content, sequencing content, and selecting appropriate teaching strategies. They wanted more specific direction and complained that the school system's curriculum guides lacked specificity. Some lamented not choosing the other internship program because they felt they needed a more gradual entry into teaching. Older Internship 2 subjects with more life experiences did not report these stresses. Many, in fact, reported that they liked the absence of such structure and were able to apply their own.

Ethnographic data identified several Internship 2 subjects who noted stresses related to inadequate materials and supplies needed for instruction. Others reported events that caused them

to believe that their school administrators neither supported nor respected teachers as professionals. For example, one administrator placed in the faculty lounge, a chart listing each faculty member. Stars were placed after the names of people who had completed certain paperwork or meetings.

Mentor Support

Data in Table 6 indicate that the 4-Year subjects had significantly ($p < .05$) more positive attitudes toward their cooperating teachers than Internship 2 subjects' had toward their mentors. Only Helpful/Not Helpful ratings differed significantly among all three groups with Internship 2 subjects viewing their classroom mentors to be significantly less helpful than the others. This finding is consistent with the reduced contact Internship 2 subjects had with their mentor-teachers.

No significant differences existed among the groups regarding how they viewed their pedagogical mentors or university supervisors (see Table 7). All groups viewed the support university faculty provided as positive.

The perceived tenseness of the internship by the Internship 2 subjects and their less positive views of classroom mentors may be related to the point made earlier and verified by research done with a prior cohort (Etheridge, 1986a; Butler, 1986). These subjects were on their own, with complete teaching responsibility from the first day of the internship and had limited access to their mentors. Internship 1 and 4-Year subjects, because of their close proximity to their mentoring teachers, had support readily available and their immersion into

teaching was more gradual and thus, less tense (Etheridge, 1986b).

School Organization

As indicated in Table 8, significant differences ($p < .01$) existed between 4-Year and Internship 2 subjects with regard to organization of the schools. The 4-Year subjects differed significantly from Internship 2 subjects by viewing schools as more organized and more democratic. Low mean ratings, however, indicate that all subjects tended to view school as restrictive, authoritarian, and tense. This authoritarian view was noted by several interns in interview sessions who were surprised that school administrators treated teachers like children, citing instances of teachers being publicly criticized because of minor rule infractions such as, "they did not have their names on every page of the lesson plans".

School Faculty

Data in Table 9 indicate that all subjects viewed school faculties positively, though 4-Year subjects consistently held the most positive view. Total scale means and means for five paired adjectives were found to differ significantly with all differences existing between the 4-year and the two internship groups. The 4-Year subjects viewed school faculties to be significantly more helpful and supportive than the Internship 1 group and viewed school faculties to be significantly more positive, encouraging, and sharing than the Internship 2 group. No differences were observed between the two internship groups.

Interview data clarify these positive views of school faculties. Most subjects reported that classroom teachers were willing to share materials, information about school politics, teaching strategies, and how to deal with parents. They were impressed that assistance was willingly provided and information willingly given. Many reported amazement and pleasure with the cooperative nature of the teaching profession that they experienced.

Students

Regarding perceptions of their students, 4-Year subjects' total scale mean rating was significantly more positive than Internship 2 subjects (Table 10). Significant differences among the item means occurred between 4-Year and Internship 2 groups with the 4-year group rating students as more responsible, interested, and cooperative. Also, the 4-Year group viewed students as significantly ($p < .01$) more interested than did either internship group. No significant differences were found between the two internship groups. Time may be a decisive factor here. In Internships 1 and 2, interns assume more complete teacher roles than do student teachers thus their students have time to become comfortable and act as they would with any teacher. Interns may have a more realistic view of their students than do student teachers. Because of the constricted nature of student teaching, student teachers may be viewed by their students as novelties, thus causing students to seem more interested, cooperative, and responsible. In a related study which seems to support this explanation, Etheridge, Butler and Douzenis (1987)

assessed the views of internship 1 subjects as they progressed through the phased internship and found them to be consistently positive except that the interns' positive views of students had declined as the internship concluded (p. 16).

School Environment

The two internship groups did not differ significantly in their perceptions of the school environment. However, student teachers' were found to view school environments as significantly more academic than Internship 1 interns and significantly more facilitating than did Internship 2 interns (Table 11). The 4-Year subjects consistently reported more positive views of the school environment than did the Internship 2 group.

Overall, upon completion of the internship or student teaching, 4-Year subjects (student teaching group) held more positive views of schools and school components than did the two internship groups. Studies summarized by Hersh, Hull, and Leighton (1982, p. 1815) criticized the student teaching model because of attitude changes associated with it, including a decrease in idealism. While data presented here do not deal with attitude shifts they do indicate that upon completion of their culminating field experiences student teaching subjects held more positive views than did the internship groups and the least positive views were held by the immersion internship subjects (Internship 2). Internship 2 subjects, being totally immersed in the teaching role for an extended period of time, may have had greater opportunity to become disillusioned with teaching and the workplace.

In addition, age may be a factor effecting group views. The 4-year students' median age was 15.5 years younger than Internship 1 subjects' median age and 6.5 years younger than the Internship 2 subjects. Thus, 4-Year students may have viewed their experience through the idealism of youth and inexperience.

Summary of Findings

Through analysis and interpretation of both quantitative and qualitative data, this study investigated 1) differences in internship activities engaged in by subjects completing three different culminating field experiences and 2) differences in perceptions subjects held toward their experiences, mentor support, and school related factors. The three programs under scrutiny were: a 4-Year baccalaureate program with 10-12 weeks student teaching, a masters degree program with a phased nine-month internship, and graduate level certification program with immersion nine-month internship. Findings in this study do not suggest that one program is superior but they do indicate that similar and different outcomes result. Major findings were:

1. The three groups were not found to differ in their levels of involvement in instructional implementation activities, instructional recordkeeping activities, and instructional preparation activities. All groups reported high levels of participation in these activities.
2. Significant differences between groups were observed for non-instructional activities with student teachers and phased internship students reporting significantly higher levels of participation in observations of classroom instruction and observations of non-instructional activities.

3. Total immersion interns reported significantly more participation in parent conferences and school and department meetings than the other two groups.
4. Subjects in the phased internship reported significantly lower levels of talking with other teachers in the school than did student teachers or interns in the total immersion program.
5. Subjects completing the immersion internship viewed their experiences to be significantly more tense than did those completing student teaching or the phased internship. Younger (under age 30) interns in the immersion model were more likely to report feeling lost thus this model may not be appropriate for younger entry-year teachers.
6. Student teachers and phased internship students viewed their classroom teacher mentors as significantly more helpful than did immersion internship students.
7. Student teachers viewed schools, teachers, and their students more positively than did the teaching interns. The two internship groups were not found to vary significantly in their perceptions of these factors.
8. Student teachers rated the schools as significantly more organized, and less authoritarian than did total immersion subjects.
9. Student teachers viewed their students as being significantly more responsible and cooperative than did the total immersion interns and significantly more interested than did either of the two internship model groups. The two internship groups did not vary.

10. Student teachers viewed school environments as more academic and facilitating. The two internship groups did not vary.
11. Variations of perceptions observed consistently found the 4-year subjects (student teachers) to be more positive toward the schools. The two internship groups while less positive than the student teaching group, did not differ. Findings suggest that the extended time period of the internships, less opportunity for student teachers to be fully inducted into the roles and responsibilities of teachers and the total life of the school, and age differences may be factors contributing to the variations noted. While not explored here, it is possible that 4-year subjects' socialization experiences in the 4-year program with extensive field experiences may also be a factor responsible for the more positive views reported.

Table 1

Demographic Data for Teacher Induction Subjects

AGE				
	Median	Range	Mean	SD
4-Year	23	21-48	24.9	6.22
Internship 1	38.5	22-56	35.6	9.99
Internship 2	32	24-50	31.76	6.99
SEX				
	Male	Female		
4-Year	18	32		
Internship 1	11	19		
Internship 2	8	9		
RACE				
	White	Black		
4-Year	41	9		
Internship 1	28	2		
Internship 2	15	2		

Table 2

Content Areas of Teacher Induction Subjects

	4-Year	Intern 1	Intern 2
English	8	8	5
Math	4	3	3
Science	3	5	6
Social Science	11	5	1
Art	1	1	1
Music	5	2	
Business	3	4	
Foreign Lan.	1	1	1
Special Ed.	2		
Physical Ed.	5		
Home Ec	4	1	

Table 3

School Settings of Interns and Students Teachers

SCHOOL TYPE	4-Year	Intern 1	Intern 2
Senior High	33	23	14
Junior High	17	6	3
Elementary		1	

Table 4

Intern Involvement in Teaching Activities

0 = no involvement 5 = high involvement

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
<u>INSTRUCTIONAL IMPLEMENTATION</u>				
Tutoring Individual Students	2.70 1.61	2.96 1.40	2.94 1.43	
Monitoring/Assisting Students	4.33 .99	4.07 .92	4.35 .78	
Providing Small Group Instruction	3.37 1.59	3.55 1.43	3.47 1.28	
Providing Large Group Instruction	4.33 1.33	4.10 1.65	4.53 .72	
Directing Laboratory Activities	2.20 2.16	2.32 2.16	1.41 2.15	
Using Materials, Equipment, etc.	4.20 .94	4.10 .94	3.88 1.11	
<u>INSTRUCTIONAL RECORD KEEPING</u>				
Taking Roll	4.53 1.01	4.55 .91	4.53 1.12	
Grading Papers, Tests, Lab Work	4.81 .59	4.86 .35	5.00 .00	
Being Responsible for Homeroom	2.73 2.06	3.17 1.71	2.63 2.33	
Maintaining Records	4.17 1.18	4.62 .68	4.41 .62	

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 4 continued

Intern Involvement in Teaching Activities

0 = no involvement 5 = high involvement

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
<u>NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</u>				
Observing Classroom Instruction	4.11 1.11	4.10 1.0	3.18 1.18	1-3,2-3 **
Observing Non-Instructional Act.	3.92 1.12	4.00 1.13	2.38 1.54	1-3,2-3 **
Observing Other Teachers	3.11 1.60	2.66 1.23	3.24 1.25	
Interacting with Teachers/Admin	4.15 1.19	3.52 1.18	4.29 .92	*
Assisting with Extracurr. Act.	2.81 1.17	2.89 1.45	3.24 1.85	
Attending Faculty Meetings	2.98 1.84	3.55 1.53	4.82 .73	1-3,2-3 **
Participate Parent Conferences	1.30 1.61	2.45 1.76	3.65 1.17	1-2,2-3 **
Participate School/Dept Meetings	1.63 1.62	2.36 1.72	3.88 1.36	1-2,2-3 **
Conference with Classroom Mentor	4.17 1.26	4.55 .78	3.69 1.40	
Conference with University Mentor	3.19 1.63	3.90 1.17	3.35 1.41	
Talking with Other Teachers	4.26 1.05	3.48 1.18	4.41 .94	1-2,2-3 **
Meeting Other Teachers/Sch Staff	4.04 1.37	3.36 1.28	4.24 .97	*

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 4 continued

Intern Involvement in Teaching Activities

0 = no involvement 5 = high involvement

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
<u>INSTRUCTIONAL PREPARATION</u>				
Preparing Instructional Materials	4.69 .64	4.62 .82	4.69 .60	
Reviewing Curr. Guides/Resources	3.80 1.17	3.86 1.41	3.76 1.30	
Designing Daily Lesson Plans	4.56 .96	4.59 .73	4.62 .72	
Designing Daily Tests/Evaluations	4.26 1.06	4.28 1.03	4.47 .71	
Developing Student Profiles	2.56 1.77	2.24 1.35	2.42 1.66	
Developing Instructional Units	4.41 .90	4.34 .94	4.12 1.17	

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 5

Intern Views of Internship Experiences

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
(1) Contrived/Free	3.89 .97	3.90 .80	3.44 1.09	
(1) Tense/Relaxed	3.58 1.12	3.83 .95	2.35 1.32	1-3,2-3 **
(1) Irrelevant/Relevant	4.70 .64	4.67 .61	4.47 .87	
(1) Not Helpful/Helpful	4.77 .54	4.77 .57	4.65 .70	
(1) Restrictive/Permissive	3.62 1.00	3.70 1.09	3.18 1.18	
(1) Negative/Positive	4.58 .95	4.37 .96	4.35 1.00	
TOTAL	25.10 3.45	25.20 3.83	22.20 4.58	1-3,2-3 *

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 6

Intern Views of Classroom Teacher Mentor

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Not Helpful/Helpful	4.78 .57	4.10 .81	4.00 1.21	1-3,2-3	*
(1)Negative/Positive	4.78 .63	4.60 .67	4.25 .93	1-3	*
(1)NonSupportive/Supportive	4.81 .65	4.63 .67	4.19 1.05	1-3	*
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	3.90 1.07	3.70 1.15	4.25 .86		
(1)Discouraging/Encouraging	4.71 .72	4.67 .66	4.19 .91	1-3	*
(1)Nonsharing/Sharing	4.77 .57	4.53 .86	4.37 1.20		*
(1)Unavailable/Available	4.85 .56	4.60 .77	4.31 1.08	1-3	*
TOTAL	32.4 4.06	31.3 4.19	29.5 5.60	1-3	*

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 7

Intern Views of Pedagogical Mentor

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
(1)Not helpful/Helpful	4.41 1.05	4.03 1.30	4.12 1.22	
(1)Negative/Positive	4.69 .61	4.47 .86	4.53 .87	*
(1)Nonsupportive/Supportive	4.65 .76	4.43 .93	4.59 .71	
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	3.81 1.02	3.67 .96	3.88 1.36	
(1)Discouraging/Encouraging	4.64 .78	4.43 1.01	4.53 .87	
(1)Nonsharing/Sharing	4.48 .90	4.03 1.13	4.12 1.27	
(1)Unavailable/Available	4.38 .94	3.83 1.23	4.35 1.11	
TOTAL	31.00 4.99	28.90 5.72	30.10 5.90	

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 8

Intern Views of School Organization

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Unorganized/Organized	4.28 .93	3.69 .87	3.47 1.42	1-3	**
(1)Tense/Relaxed	3.27 1.05	2.76 .87	2.59 1.32		**
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	2.86 1.01	2.65 .94	2.24 1.34		*
(1)Authoritarian/Democratic	2.69 1.02	2.55 1.05	1.82 1.13	1-3	**
TOTAL	12.90 2.84	11.60 2.52	10.10 3.71	1-3	**

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 9

Intern Views of School Faculties

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Not Helpful/Helpful	4.47 .82	3.83 .91	4.18 .81	1-2	**
(1)Negative/Positive	4.34 .90	3.80 .92	3.53 1.23	1-3	**
(1)Nonsupportive/Supportive	4.32 .94	3.73 .91	3.88 1.11	1-2	**
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	3.30 .85	3.33 .66	3.29 1.10		
(1)Discouraging/Encouraging	4.22 .87	3.77 .86	3.50 1.21	1-3	**
(1)Nonsharing/Sharing	4.18 .88	3.57 .82	3.88 1.11	1-3	**
TOTAL	24.70 4.23	22.00 3.98	22.00 4.78	1-2	**

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 10

Intern Views of Students

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1) Incapable/Capable	4.15 .91	3.83 .98	3.76 1.03		**
(1) Irresponsible/Responsible	3.17 .97	2.97 .93	2.29 .98	1-3	**
(1) Unhappy/Happy	3.64 .81	3.67 .99	3.59 .94		*
(1) Disinterested/Interested	3.56 .75	3.03 1.10	2.59 1.00	1-2, 1-3	**
(1) Uncooperative/Cooperative	3.74 .76	3.43 .93	3.06 1.30	1-3	**
TOTAL	18.20 3.27	16.90 3.86	15.20 3.89	1-3	**

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 11

Intern Views of School Physical/Cultural Environment

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Unsafe/Safe	4.11 .85	4.03 .85	4.00 .71		
(1)Non-Academic/Academic	4.11 .80	3.33 .96	3.76 .75	1-2	**
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	2.69 .85	3.00 .91	2.29 1.21		**
(1)Hindering/Facilitating	3.72 .88	3.17 .98	3.06 1.09	1-3	**
(1)Stifling/Stimulating	3.52 .99	3.33 1.03	3.12 1.05		*
TOTAL	18.20 2.77	16.80 3.05	16.20 2.38		**

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

References

- AFT Task Force (1986). The revolution that is overdue. AFT Executive Council.
- Becker, H. (1964). Personal change in adult life. Sociometry, 27, 40-53.
- Bolam, R. (1987). Induction of beginning teachers. In M.J. Duncan (Ed.), The international encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education (pp. 745-757). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Butler, E. D. (1986). Mentor perceptions of mentoring and internships in MAT and Lyndhurst programs: Cycle I. Memphis, TN: Center of Excellence in Teacher Education, Memphis State University.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: The Forum.
- Etheridge, C. P. (1986a). The students' perspective: Lyndhurst program, cycle I. Memphis, TN: Center of Excellence in Teacher Education, Memphis State University.
- Etheridge, C. P. (1986b). The students' perspective: MAT program, cycle I. Memphis, TN: Center of Excellence in Teacher Education, Memphis State University.
- Etheridge, G. W., Butler, E. D., & Douzenis, C. (1987). Graduated teaching internships: An overview and major findings. Paper presented at the meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, AL.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. S. Shulman & Sykes, G. (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.
- Griffin, G. A. (1985). Teacher induction: Research issues. Journal of Teacher Education, 36, 42-46.
- Haberman, M. (1983). Research on preservice laboratory and clinical experiences: Implications for teacher education. In K. R. Howey, & Gardner, (Eds.), The education of teachers (pp. 98-117). New York: Longman.

- Hersh, R.H., Hull, R., & Leighton, M.S. (1982). Student teaching. In H. E. Mitzel, (Ed.) Encyclopedia of educational research (5th ed.). Free Press, New York. 1812-1822.
- Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Mich: The Holmes Group.
- Howey, K. R. and Zimpher, N. L. (1987). The role of higher education in initial year of teaching programs. in G. A. Griffin, & S. Millies, (Eds.) The first years of teaching. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Hutchinson, S. A. (1986). Education and grounded theory. Journal of Thought. 21:3, 50-68.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 342-360.
- Lortie, D. (1966). Teacher socialization: The Robinson Crusoe model. Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Teacher Education and Professional Standards.
- Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- McDonald, F.J. (1982). Study of induction programs for beginning teachers: Vol. 1. The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training. Princeton N.J.: Educational Testing Service.
- National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985). A call for change in teacher education. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
- Yinger, R. J. (1987). Learning the language of practice: Implications for beginning year of teaching programs. in G. A. Griffin, & S. Millies, (Eds.) The first years of teaching. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York: John Wiley.